

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Office Action dated December 5, 2007. All rejections and objections of the Examiner are respectfully traversed. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Support for the present claim amendments is found at various places in the Specification as originally filed and illustrated in the Drawings. For example, from line 22 on page 5 through line 1 on page 6, and in lines 5-6 on page 27 of the Specification a special icon is described. The special icon is further shown by icon 277 in Fig. 12. Fig. 12 shows that information for multiple documents accessed by the remote user are displayed when the local user selects the awareness display object of the remote user (e.g. clicks on 280 in Fig. 12) and hovers the cursor over the special icon (e.g. over the icon 277 in Fig. 12). No new matter has been added.

At paragraphs 2-6 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the Drawings and Specification as originally filed. Amendments to the Drawings and Specification herein are respectfully believed to meet all requirements of the Examiner in this regard.

At paragraphs 7-9 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the claims. Amendments to the claims herein are respectfully believed to meet all requirements of the Examiner in this regard.

At paragraphs 10-12, the Examiner rejected claims 19-27 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 101. Claims 19-27 and 29 have been cancelled herein.

At paragraphs 13-14 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 8-11, 17-20, and 26-29 for anticipation under 35 U.S.C. 102, citing U.S. patent number 6,507,845 of Cohen et al. ("Cohen et al."). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Cohen et al. disclose techniques for supporting improved awareness of and collaboration among users involved in a task. Cohen et al. provide techniques in which activity data is displayed simultaneously in two separate regions of a screen display. A first region in the Cohen et al. display contains a list of users in association with an activity most recently performed by each user. A second region in the Cohen et al. display can contain a list of data objects in association with an activity most recently performed on each of the data objects. Cohen et al. further teach that collaboration tools can be accessible through the list of users or the list of data objects.

Nowhere in Cohen et al. is there disclosed or suggested a method of providing remote user activity information regarding recently accessed documents of remote users to a local user, comprising:

obtaining, by an awareness client application process executing on a local computer system, from an associated awareness server application process executing on a server computer system, an online status of said remote computer system user;

*displaying, by said awareness client application process, within a user interface displayed on said local computer system, an awareness display object associated with said remote computer system user, wherein said awareness display object displays an identity of said remote computer system user, wherein said awareness display object further includes a visual indication of said online status of said remote computer system user;*

obtaining, by said awareness client application process on said local computer system, responsive to said displaying said awareness display object associated with said remote computer system user, document access activity information regarding said remote computer system user, wherein said document access activity information includes the identity of a plurality of documents accessed by said remote computer system user;

*displaying, by said awareness client application process, a special icon in said user interface displayed on said local computer system;*

detecting a selection of said awareness display object associated with said remote computer user and said special icon by said local computer system user; and

*displaying, by said awareness client application process, in response to said detecting said selection of said awareness display object associated with said remote computer system user and said special icon by said local computer system user, said*

*document access activity information regarding said remote computer system user in said user interface displayed on said local computer system.* (emphasis added)

as in the present independent claim 1. In contrast, Cohen et al. describe a system in which the user interface provides a list of users associated with a task (e.g. 212) displayed *in response to user selection of a task*. See lines 35-45 in column 6 of Cohen et al. The user entries in the resulting list 212 of Cohen et al. each include indication of a *single activity* that the corresponding user is currently performing on a *single document*, or that the user most recently performed. Accordingly, nothing in Cohen et al. describes or suggests *displaying, by said awareness client application process, in response to said detecting said selection of said awareness display object associated with said remote computer system user and said special icon by said local computer system user, said document access activity information regarding said remote computer system user in said user interface displayed on said local computer system*, as in the present independent claim 1.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Cohen et al. does not disclose or suggest all the features of the present independent claim 1. Accordingly, Cohen et al. does not anticipate the present independent claims 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102. As to claims 2 and 8-9, they each depend from claim 1, and are respectfully believed to be patentable over Cohen et al. for at least the same reasons.

In paragraphs 15-16 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 3-6, 12-15, and 21-24 for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103, citing the combination of Cohen et al. with United States published patent application 2004/0039630 of Begole et al. ("Begole et al."). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As set forth in detail above with regard to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102, Cohen et al. does not disclose or suggest *displaying, by said awareness client application process, in response to said detecting said selection of said awareness display object associated with said remote computer system user and said special icon by said local computer system user, said document access activity information regarding said remote computer system user in said user interface displayed on said local computer system*, as in the present independent claim 1. Combining either Begole et al. with Cohen et al. does not remedy this difference between the teachings of Cohen et al. and the present independent claim 1. Like Cohen et al., Begole et al. includes no hint or suggestion of even the desirability of *displaying, by said awareness client application process, in response to said detecting said selection of said awareness display object associated with said remote computer system user and said special icon by said local computer system user, said document access activity information regarding said remote computer system user in said user interface displayed on said local computer system*. In contrast, Begole et al. describe a system for inferring and applying coordination patterns from individual work and communication activity in which each stroke on the keyboard, movement of the mouse, and/or click on the mouse or GUI can provide information that a user of that particular keyboard, mouse, or GUI is present at the computer work station to which the input device is attached, and that activities may be recorded in a specific kind of log.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Cohen et al. and Begole et al. does not disclose or suggest all the features of the present independent claim 1. Accordingly, the combination of Cohen et al. and Begole et al. does not support a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 with regard to independent claim 1. As to claims 3-6,

they each depend from claim 1, and are respectfully believed to be patentable over the combination of Cohen et al. and Begole et al. for at least the same reasons.

In paragraph 17 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 7, 16, and 25 for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103, citing the combination of Cohen et al. with United States published patent application 2005/0138108 of Galvin ("Galvin"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections, submitting that Galvin should be disqualified as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(c).

#### Statement of Common Ownership

Galvin was filed on December 17, 2003, and published June 23, 2005. Since the present application was filed January 22, 2004, Galvin qualifies as prior art only under subsection 35 U.S.C. 102(e). In accordance with 35 U.S.C. 103(c), prior art used in rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) may be disqualified if it qualifies as prior art only under one or more of subsections (e), (f), and (g) of section 35 U.S.C. 102, and where the prior art and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. In the present case, Applicants hereby assert that Galvin and the subject matter of the present application were both 100% commonly owned by International Business Machines Corporation at the time the present invention was made, as evidenced by the Galvin assignee reference, and by Applicants Assignment recorded on January 22, 2004 at Reel 014924, Frame 0020. Applicants therefore respectfully request that Galvin be disqualified as prior art to Applicant's invention for purposes of 35 U.S.C. 103.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully urge that the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103, and respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103 citing Galvin be withdrawn.

Reconsideration of all claims is respectfully requested.

Applicants have cancelled and amended claims herein. However, Applicant is not conceding in this application that the unamended or cancelled claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of allowable subject matter. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue the or unamended and/or cancelled claims in one or more continuation and/or divisional patent applications.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Applicants' Attorney at the number listed below so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

May 21, 2008  
Date

/David Dagg/  
David A. Dagg, Reg. No. 37,809  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)  
44 Chapin Road  
Newton, MA 02459  
(617) 630-1131